

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

MARCO DIPRATO and	:	
MARINA BRADLEY,	:	
Plaintiffs,	:	
	:	
v.	:	CIVIL ACTION
	:	NO. 21-507
	:	
CYNTHIA BERNSTIEL,	:	
Defendant.	:	

ORDER

AND NOW, this 24th day of January, 2022, it is **ORDERED** that Defendant Cynthia Bernstiel’s Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs’ Complaint Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) (ECF No. 6) is **GRANTED with prejudice ONLY as to Plaintiffs’ Title VII Claim (Count I)**.

It is **FURTHER ORDERED** that I **DECLINE** to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiffs’ remaining state law claims.¹ As such, Plaintiffs’ state law claims in Counts II through V are **DISMISSED without prejudice** and may be brought in state court. The Clerk is directed to mark this case **CLOSED**.

s/ANITA B. BRODY, J.
ANITA B. BRODY, J.

¹ Under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c)(3), a court may decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over state law claims if “the district court has dismissed all claims over which it has original jurisdiction.” Plaintiffs’ Title VII claim was the only claim over which I exercise federal question jurisdiction, and that claim is now dismissed. As this case is in the early stages of litigation, there is no compelling reason to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiffs’ remaining state law claims.

Copies **VIA ECF**